Indi

FOR THE

No. 148. New Series.]
No. 242. Old Series.]

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1900. [Registered
Newspa

Notes and News 217
Max Müller 220
The Enquiry into the Guzerat Revenue Assessments 221
Our London Letter 222
Notes from Bombay 223
The Famine in India:
1,422,000 on Relief 224
The Mansion House Fund 224
The *Investors' Review* Fund 224
Revenue Collections in Guzerat ... 224
Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji on England's Duty 225
The Proposed National Grant ... 225
The Punjab Land Alienation Bill... 226
"Bleeding India" 226
"An Empire Adrift"... 227
Public Meetings on Indian Questions: The Work of the British Committee 227
Advertisements 228

IMPORTANT NOTICE.

In future "INDIA" will be forwarded only to persons in respect of whom subscriptions have been actually received at the London Office. To this rule there will be no exception.

A convenient Order Form for the use of subscribers is printed on page 228.

NOTES AND NEWS.

THIS week's telegrams from Lord Curzon and Lord Northcote indicate a continued improvement in the famine-stricken districts, but the end is not yet. The number of persons now in receipt of relief is 1,422,000, of whom Bombay contributes fully one-third. Relief has been discontinued in the Punjab. The Governor of Bombay reports that for the week ending October 20 there were 107 cases of cholera, 76 being fatal, in the famine-stricken districts. We do not observe any statistics regarding cholera in Native States. The total number of deaths among persons on relief works and gratuitous relief in the Bombay Presidency was, during the week, 1312. This happens to be about the number of persons accidentally injured in the London crowd last Monday, when the C.I.V. came home. But what a difference in the volume of "Imperialist" comment upon the deaths in Bombay and the casualties in London! Lord Northcote tells us that moderate rain, doing appreciable good, has fallen in the Karnatik, but that elsewhere a good fall of rain is urgently wanted.

The *Times'* Simla correspondent has reported at ample length the Viceroy's statement in the Legislative Council on October 19 regarding the famine. It was the Viceroy's cue, of course, to justify everything that had been officially done and to arrogate ample praise to the official doers in all the degrees of the famine service. Now we at least have never been careful to stint our recognition of the work done by the officials on the spot: these undoubtedly have spent their energies, some of them their very lives, in succouring the wretched people in their charge. Nor do we doubt that Lord Curzon's praise of "the noble efforts of the missionary agencies of various Christian denominations" is thoroughly well deserved. Nor yet do we hesitate to give the Government credit for the best intentions. Still we must continue to maintain that full and impartial enquiry is needed in every department of famine policy and administration, and that such enquiry is not to be prejudiced by the oratory even of the Viceroy himself.

Lord Curzon went back into last century for statistics to prove how effective the service of the present famine has been. He stated that in the Bengal famine of 1770, 10,000,000 people out of 30,000,000 perished. If this were so, it presents a ghastly contrast to the present figures, on the most liberal allowance. But are these figures of 1770 to be depended on? If critics of the Government of India were to use them, we know how promptly they would be discredited by the Government press. Again, we can quite understand Lord Curzon when he affirms that "every man, woman, and child who has perished in India in the present famine has been a burden upon my heart and upon that of the Government." Lord Curzon and his Council are humane men. But, after all, the real test is not the personal su[...] which, however, must always be postulate[...] measures that have been taken for the succour [...] tressed population.

On this fundamental point Lord Curzon boldly challenges scrutiny. We all hope that thoroughgoing scrutiny will be forthcoming. The point of difficulty is not met by Lord Curzon when he puts forward as "a special characteristic" of the campaign of famine relief during the past year "its unprecedented liberality." Such liberality may have been unprecedented, and yet may be insufficient. The effect of the unfortunate circular letter directed against indiscriminate and pauperising charity needs to be fully investigated. The intention may have been ever so good: nobody could approve of "indiscriminate" or "pauperising" charity. But the question still remains whether or not the special strictness ordained by the Government letter did not to some extent—and it may be to a very large extent—impose unnecessary suffering. It is very well to be "prepared to accept any expenditure of which it could be shown that it was required to save life or to mitigate genuine distress"; but the decision inevitably lay with the local officials, and the local officials were governed by the spirit, as well as by the letter, of the circular ukase.

It is somewhat curious that Lord Curzon should admit that in Gujerat "the weakness and incapacity for resistance of the people took the local Government by surprise." He points to the lack of "greater previous experience" of famine in these parts as an explanation, if not as a justification. He denies, too, that the failure was due to "any antecedent orders on the part of the Government or parsimony in the scheme of relief." But why was the local Government taken by surprise? Why is it the local Government knows so little about the actual condition of the people it is supposed to govern? Lord Curzon "feels that the excessive mortality in Gujerat is a phenomenon of which it is difficult to give a full explanation, and which may still call for further enquiry." Undoubtedly further enquiry is necessary. But a mere official enquiry does not promise any trustworthy results. This appears only too clearly from the facts that have already come out in connexion with the allegations of "Gujerati" and the personal enquiries conducted by Mr. Parekh. If it be the fact, as apparently it is, that the staying powers of the Gujeratis—at any rate in certain districts—have been steadily declining during the past half dozen years, the ignorance of the local Government comes perilously near to guilt.

We cannot agree with Lord Curzon's opinion that the contributions in aid of famine relief have been "munificent"; on the contrary, we do hold that "this assistance has been scant and disappointing." "The United Kingdom's contribution of 88½ lakhs," he says, "compared indifferently with its contribution of 123 lakhs in 1896-97, but in the circumstances of the year it is a noble gift." It does compare indifferently indeed; and the "noble gift" is but a diplomatic phrase, little in consonance with the current boasts of "Imperialism." The "circumstances of the year"—that is to say, the South African war—should have very little to do with the matter; and did not the *Times* itself tell us that the cost of that war scarcely touched more than the veriest fringe of the national wealth? A national grant was officially refused. We observe, with not a little interest, that Lord Curzon has impeached the charity of the Indians. "A careful observation of the figures and proceedings in each province," he remarks, "compels me to say that Native India has not yet reached as high a standard of practical philanthropy and charity as might reasonably be expected."

imilarly im- hardly be ont to flow in ighbourhood of the k that a charge of lack y rests insecure foundations.

Lord Curzon specified the points of en- he famine. He said :—

> compare the various relief systems and their the different provinces to see in what respects where they are too rigid or too lax, to investi- er the vexed questions of large works *versus* small, and ntration *versus* relief dispersion. We shall have to ex- the rival merits of relief establishments and unconditional uitous relief. When the rains break we must consider how far a sudden excessive mortality may be explained or prevented; we must ascertain the best means of bringing home relief in the form of revenue remissions or suspensions with the greatest promptitude and directness to the people; we must investigate and report upon the various public works which have been undertaken, and provide for the execution of a continuous programme of preventive works in the future.

All very well, but prevention appears only by the narrowest squeak in the last clause, and then it is limited to "preventive works." This question of prevention—of investigation of the real causes of famine—is at the root of the whole matter; and all other enquiries are the merest bagatelle in comparison. Yet Lord Curzon does not appear to have in his mind any such far-reaching enquiry as we have over and over again urged as the minimum necessity of the situation.

The Punjab Land Alienation Bill has been passed into law. According to Lord Curzon it is directed, not against "the model money-lender," but against "the Shylock who insists upon his pound of flesh and who under the existing system is in the habit of taking it in land because it is the one security which his debtor can furnish." It remains to be seen how the squeezing of Shylock will operate upon the needy landholder. Sir E. F. Law, the Financial Member, stated that "the question of credit in a new form for landholders in consequence of there being a new demand for credit was receiving the attention of the Government," and he seemed to point to the establishment of agricultural banks, not only in the Punjab, but throughout India. Probably the establishment of agri-cultural banks would have obviated all necessity for this unsatisfactory Act. It is sufficiently ominous that the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab was at pains to emphasise the fact that the Bill was initiated, not by his Government, but by the Government of India. Throughout the discussions, he said, he had been conscious of seeing more clearly the objections to such drastic legislation than the arguments in favour of it. He declared himself personally "very doubtful, and even apprehensive, of the effects of such a measure." He professed that he had waived his own opinion and endeavoured to make the Bill as workable as possible. He earnestly hoped "that it might conduce more than he anticipated to the welfare of the agricultural population of the Punjab." Such an outspoken opinion by the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, who ought to know more about the matter than any of the Viceroy's other advisers, does not inspire much hope in the operation of the Act.

Professor Robert Wallace, who occupies the chair of Agriculture and Rural Economy in the University of Edinburgh, has delivered and published a "Lecture on Famine in India" (Edinburgh. Oliver and Boyd). This lecture was "the inaugural address in connexion with the course of lectures on Colonial and Indian Agriculture specially endowed" by two well-meaning gentlemen. It forms a pamphlet of fifty-six close-printed pages. Professor Wallace has diligently extracted the substance of well-known official reports, and run the matter into a readable account of famines in India, with explanation of the mode of relief, official and charitable, and some notice of the part played by railways and irrigation works. He thinks that "the landholding, cultivating classes are now much better off than formerly": "they are now in a position to reduce expenses of living by lowering their standard of comfort or falling back on savings"! The pamphlet is simply a laborious compilation following the official reports blindly, and displaying not a glimpse of critical competence. Professor Wallace claims "that the triumphant application of the recently improved and almost perfect system of famine relief for India is perhaps the greatest administrative triumph of this or any time." We look in vain for any examination of the question whether and how the necessity for such an application could have been obviated in the past or can be prevented in the future.

Rájá Peary Mohun Mookerji, C.S.I., knows a vast deal more about it than Professor Wallace. "Why," he asks, in his Presidential Address to the British Indian Association (September 22), "Why does the same tale of grinding poverty come from all parts of the country?" He answers mainly by suggestion; but he lays great stress on the "ill-advised settlements of land revenue," on the expensive administrative agency, and on the economic drain. He speaks of the cause of famine thus :—

> To say that the famine is caused by a bad monsoon, by the failure of crops amidst a rapidly increasing population, is to stifle enquiry, when the necessity of such enquiry is imperative in the interests of the vast millions of India. . . . When the quantity of grain annually exported from the country is so very large, when nearly a fourth of the culturable land in Bengal and other provinces is still lying fallow, and when the opening for industrial occupations is practically unlimited, one can hardly listen with patience to any argument ascribing the incidence of famine to an increase of population. . . . The truth can be no longer ignored that it is the poverty of the people which is at the root of the frequent recurrence of famines in India.

And "unfortunately the measures which have been taken by Government for attenuating the evil have tended simply to aggravate it"—illustrations being drawn from the expenditure on, and the management of, railways and irrigation works.

The *Pioneer* has three allusions in widely different connexions to the relations of British India and the Native States. The first is called forth by the announcement of the retirement of Sir Trevor Plowden, the Resident at Hyderabad. Our contemporary does not hide its conviction that he was unfitted for such a post. He had previously been Resident in Kashmir and had succeeded in leaving that quiet realm "seething with intrigue and disturbance." His appointment to Hyderabad is described as one of the most unaccountable ever perpetrated by the Government of India; and it is not surprising to hear that "taking over Hyderabad from the hands of Sir Dennis Fitzpatrick, whose wise and tolerant administration had brought quiet and contentment, he speedily transformed the character of its politics." In view of the great powers vested in the Resident it is indeed a scandal that Sir Trevor should have been rewarded for his failure at Kashmir by promotion to a position in which he had even more opportunities of mischief. The story of his career should make the public very careful not to condemn the administrators of any Native State on the unsupported testimony of the Resident.

Again, in dealing with the Report on Police Administration in the North-West Provinces, the *Pioneer* has a good laugh at the inclination of the Police to set down their own shortcomings to the contiguity of ill-administered Native States :—

> The Agra District is bordered by Native States, and is notorious for dacoities. There is a tendency in the ordinary police mind to connect the two facts: a Native State is regarded as the home and breeding ground of dacoits, and Native officials are regarded as their fautors and abettors, and the Native police are condemned as non-co-operators: a Native State is in fact for dacoits what a reserved jungle is for tigers. Whether the Native States return the compliment does not appear: but in the present instance they would not have been far wrong.

It turned out in the end that nearly all the criminals were men of the Agra District, and that while the Agra police were quarrelling with the police of the Native States, one of the most notorious of the dacoits was living at the police mess and reading about himself in the *Police Punch.*

Lastly, in dealing with some new regulations as to fines and holidays in public offices, the *Pioneer* incidentally refers to the much greater freedom from red-tape enjoyed in the administration of Native States. Our contemporary tells the following story :—

> A certain official . . . . was snatched up into the Simla circle to fill a temporary vacancy. . . . . This nimble-witted gentleman's soul was vexed by the roundabout methods in force at headquarters, and at last his impatience found vent in flippancy. Let us suppose that the question raised was the provision of barracks for policemen; it was started (whatever it was) from our friend's office, and before it

came back to him the case had been to the Financial, the Legislative, and the Public Works Departments. In noting upon it a second time for the information of the head of his office he wrote: "By some oversight this case has not yet been seen by the Bishop of Calcutta."

Needless to say, he was severely reproved and did not stay long at Simla, but

he is now in the employ of a Native State where the bonds of red-tape are somewhat loosely tied and where it is possible for the Inspector-General of Gaols to provide tooth-brushes for all prisoners without first asking the Treasury if they can be purchased locally or by indent from the Secretary of State, consulting the Sanitary Commissioner as to the relative merits of English toothbrushes as compared with the Native implement, and obtaining plans and estimates from the Public Works Department for the provision of racks to hold the tooth-brushes when purchased.

But while the *Pioneer* thus admits that reform in the public administration is required, it finds little to agree with in the recent circulars as to fines and holidays in public offices. It looks for reform in other directions:—

What the public would like to see would be some effort at making procedure more business-like and practical: some improvement in the delays that occur in dealing with correspondence: some effort to impress upon Government officers that people outside their offices are not necessarily a subject race.

But would it not be better still to impress upon Government officers that none should be treated as if they belonged to a subject race?

Another great Anglo-Indian organ, the *Times of India*, speaking more directly and of another matter, joins the *Pioneer* in praise of Native rule. It says:—

The vigorous and enlightened relief programme undertaken by the Thakore of Morvi, and the well-considered measures inaugurated by the Chiefs of Gondal and Bhavnagar fully met, so far as human agency and the means at their disposal permitted, the needs of their subjects in the past calamitous year.

Nor are such States in Rajputana as Jodhpur, Jaipur and Kishengarh behind those in Kathiawar already mentioned. Two points in regard to Gondal may be specially mentioned. First, though almost the whole district was the prey of famine, not a single life was lost through starvation, and there was only a slight rise in the general mortality. Secondly, in regard to the collection of revenue, now such a burning question in Bombay, one-quarter only of the assessment was collected, another quarter being at once remitted, and the remaining half suspended.

The annual "Summary of Events of the Administration of the Gondal State" is always interesting. This year famine is a prominent feature in it—a quite unusual feature; and the operations in combating it, which are carefully detailed and illustrated by a plan of the relief camp at the Veri Tank work, appear to have been carried out in consonance with the foresight and liberality of the Thakore Sahib. Notwithstanding the disorganisation caused by the famine, the dacoities were no more than in the previous year—only two. Naturally, however, "there is a large increase in the number of simple thefts and thefts by housebreaking, as well as in the number of robberies." It is noteworthy that "the abnormal condition of the year has had little injurious influence" over the general working of the education department.

The *Friend of India*, an Anglo-Indian newspaper, deals at some length with the new regulations regarding the admission of Indians to Coopers Hill, and finds justification for them "neither in the facts of the case nor in the feeble apology for his action put forward by Lord George Hamilton in the House of Commons." It contends that neither political, physical nor moral reasons are applicable to the exclusion of Indians from the higher branch of the Public Works Department. Physical qualifications are the subject of special tests. Of moral qualifications, no special courage is needed to construct a road or a bridge; while in view of the many Indians who have worthily filled seats on the judicial bench, how can it be predicated of Indians that they are necessarily wanting in integrity or self-respect?

At a meeting of the Asiatic Society in Simla, Mr. Meyer, I.C.S., recently gave a lecture on Roman Provincial Administration, a subject worthy of the attention of all Anglo-Indians. One great difference which Mr. Meyer pointed out between the Roman government and ours is that the Romans set up no organised bureaucracy, and some important functions were discharged by local indigenous agency. The example has been followed by Russia in her Asiatic dominions, and, as the *Hindu* points out, this accounts for the moderate popularity of Russian rule—a popularity which Englishmen, accustomed to consider Russia as the incarnation of tyranny, find it so difficult to understand. But the parallel may be pushed even further. In Rome some of the greatest Emperors were themselves Provincials, and birth even in recently conquered districts did not debar a man of ability from reaching the highest honours; and in Russia we have seen a Tartar obtaining high rank in the Russian service and commanding a Russian army. When will our ignorant pride allow us to see the same in British India?

Mr. David McLaren Morrison, formerly of Calcutta, has brought together a number of newspaper cuttings under the title "India and Imperial Federation." (London: Sampson Low, Marston, and Co.). "Imperial Federation," he says, "owes its origin to Disraeli:" but he has something yet to learn of Disraeli's attitude towards the Colonies. We are very familiar with the demonstrations of loyalty in India in recent months, though we are of opinion that Mr. Morrison has hardly yet appreciated all the significance of it. By all means let us have India and Britain brought into the closest bonds of friendship and sympathy. But how? Mr. Morrison's plan is to form an "Army of Imperial Federation," in which, of course, the Native Princes would enrol themselves and their militant subjects. Then "Great Britain will be the peace-maker of the world, for, with such an army at her back, she will become the world's arbitrator," etc. We take the following sentences from a short letter to the *Englishman* (Feb. 27, 1900), signed "Enquirer":—

Surely, before venturing on a new undertaking, from which it would be difficult to withdraw, a study of the country in all its aspects, in the mofussil as well as in the towns, among the masses as well as with the princes, in the past equally with the present, in the light of such conclusions as students in a wider field have been able to establish, is needed. Has Mr. Morrison made such a study his own?

Mr. Gilbert Murray has an interesting paper in the November number of the *Positivist Review* upon "What the Imperialists mean by 'Imperialism.'" We are not sure that he is quite fair to Sir Edward Grey, who has described "the true Imperial feeling" as being "not afraid of making your strength felt where British interests are concerned." Mr. Murray assumes—what Sir Edward Grey, we suspect, would stoutly deny—that the only mode of "making your strength felt" is to go to war. On the general question, however, Mr. Murray is sound enough:—

The word Imperialist—bad as it is from many points of view—can be rationally understood as denoting one who habitually considers the interests of the British Empire as a whole, as opposed to a "Little-Englander" who only cares for the interests of England itself. This is a perfectly real and intelligible antithesis. An Imperialist in the only true sense is one who feels himself a citizen of the British Empire, and regards all subjects of the Queen as his fellow-subjects. A "Little-Englander" is a man who does not really regard Canadians, Australians, Irishmen, and Indians as his fellow-subjects or fellow-citizens, and who is ready to misgovern, despoil, or neglect them, if the exclusive interests of England so demand.

And again:—

No English Government ventures to thwart the wishes of Canada or Australia. The Australian Irish may be harried occasionally. The French Canadians may be disregarded or insulted; but even that process must be kept within narrow limits. Any liberties taken with the self-governing colonies are dangerous. But India is helpless. There we can see the difference between the true Imperialist and the Little-Englander standpoint. A Little-England Government does not recognise Indians as fellow-subjects. It debars Indians from their own civil service. It makes wars for its English interest, and over-taxes India to pay for them. It neglects India in time of famine.

That turns the tables on the bastard Imperialists neatly and fairly enough.

Remittances on India for 30 lakhs were on Wednesday offered for tender by the India Council, and applications amounting to Rs.8,01,40,000 in bills were received at 1s. 3$\frac{31}{32}$d. and 1s. 3$\frac{1}{16}$d. The amounts allotted were, 15 lakhs in bills on Calcutta and 15 lakhs in bills on Madras at an average of 1s. 3·9375d. Tenders at 1s. 3$\frac{1}{16}$d. will receive about 16 per cent. Later the Council sold bills for Rs.15,000 on Calcutta, Rs. 10,000 on Bombay, and Rs.10,000 on Madras at 1s. 3$\frac{3}{4}$d. Last week remittances for Rs.26,20,000 were sold for £173,675, making the total disposed of from April 1 to Tuesday night Rs.7,37,50,287, producing £4,904,418. Next week 30 lakhs will again be offered.

MAX MÜLLER.

PROFESSOR MAX MÜLLER, we deeply regret to announce, died on Sunday last at Oxford. "We lose in him," says the *Times*, "one of the most brilliant and prolific writers of our time; one whose voice has charmed several generations of Englishmen; who was a great scholar, a favourite in society, the friend and intimate of the most distinguished men of his time; who, coming to England early in life, threw in his lot with us and was counted among our foremost writers." The summary is but a pale indication of the various lines of distinction of Max Müller. It is not our purpose, however, to fill out the outline. Rather it is for us to dwell upon his relations with India and Indians.

From his distinguished father Wilhelm Müller, the poet of Dessau, Max Müller derived the poetic feeling that transfuses his prose and tends to lift his argument beyond the dry and hard facts, as well as his early and pronounced aptitude for philological studies, and his imaginative, rather than scientific, interest in philosophical speculation. While yet in his teens, he became Bopp's favourite pupil in comparative philology, and no man has done more than he to establish and expound the science founded by his master. At the same time he plunged into the study of Eastern languages, and especially of Sanskrit, and, having published a translation of the "Hitopadesa" at the age of twenty, he passed to Paris to learn more from Burnouf. It was through Bunsen that he was enabled to publish the "Rig-Veda." Writing in 1867, Max Müller said:—

> More than twenty years have passed since my revered friend Bunsen called me one day into his library at Carlton House Terrace, and announced to me with beaming eyes that the publication of the "Rig-Veda" was secure. He had spent many days in seeing the Directors of the East India Company and explaining to them the importance of this work and the necessity of having it published in England. At last his efforts had been successful, the funds for printing my edition of the text and commentary of the Sacred Hymns of the Brâhmans had been granted, and Bunsen was the first to announce to me the happy result of his literary diplomacy. "Now," he said, "you have got a work for life—a large block that will take years to plane and polish." "But mind," he added, "let us have from time to time some chips from your workshop." . . . . "Your work is not finished when you have brought the ore from the mine; it must be sifted, smelted, refined, and coined before it can be of real use and contribute towards the intellectual food of mankind."

The "Rig-Veda" accordingly appeared in six volumes published at varying intervals between 1849 and 1874; and the "Chips from a German Workshop," as well as many other essays and lectures, show how amply Max Müller followed out Bunsen's suggestions, his principal endeavour being "to bring out of even the most abstruse subjects the points of real interest that ought to engage the attention of the public at large, and never to leave a dark nook or corner without attempting to sweep away the cobwebs of false learning and let in the light of real knowledge." The criticisms passed upon his achievement only bring into greater relief the substantial efficiency of his work. As to the "Rig-Veda" it may be added that, when original sets came to be selling at double the published price, Max Müller vainly proposed to the Secretary of State for India that the cost of printing a new edition should be borne by the Government, and that he was helped out of the difficulty by the enlightened and lamented Mahárájá of Vijayanagar, who defrayed the expenses of the four-volume edition of 1890-92.

Max Müller's next great enterprise in Eastern Literature—the "Sacred Books of the East"—was also within an ace of being lost to the credit of England. In 1875 Max Müller had serious thoughts of returning to the Fatherland; and the Imperial Academy of Vienna and the Finance Minister had offered to defray all the cost of publication and to instal him in a Professorship in the University of Vienna. The University of Oxford, however, came forward with an offer to publish the series; and, slow and qualified as had been Oxford's recognition of him, he was yet grateful, and accepted the offer. The first volume appeared in 1879, and since then the series has run to over fifty volumes. Meantime Max Müller had conceived the idea of a series of "Sacred Books of the Buddhists." The first volume appeared in 1895. The series has been issued under the patronage of the King of Siam.

To the mind of Max Müller the study of the languages of mankind naturally led to the study of human thought. "The growth of language is continuous," he wrote, "and by continuing our researches backward from the most modern to the most ancient strata, the very elements and roots of human speech have been reached, and with them the elements and roots of human thought." Naturally, therefore, his studies branched out from philology to mythology and religion. He expressly aimed at "attracting more general attention towards an independent, yet reverent, study of the ancient religions of the world, and in dispelling some of the prejudices with which so many have regarded the yearnings after truth embodied in the sacred writings of the Brâhmans, the Zoroastrians, and the Buddhists, in the mythology of the Greeks and Romans, nay, even in the wild traditions and degraded customs of Polynesian savages." It is not necessary to accept all his results; it is necessary now to accept his principles. And it is well to remember that he had to suffer for his principles, even in "enlightened" England and in the latter half of the nineteenth century. For the illustration of the origin and growth of religion in his first Hibbert lecture, in 1878, he took a survey of the religions of India.

Notwithstanding the immense work done by Max Müller in compelling Western attention to the languages, the thought, and the condition of India, yet he never visited India. A visit to India, nevertheless, was always the dream of his life. "We are not sure," says the *Times*, "that a hurried visit would have helped him in the chief work which he accomplished—the investigation of the ancient Indian world and the bringing into close relations of the submerged East and the modern West. 'What can India do for us?' was the title of one of his most successful lectures, and we doubt whether India could have done more for him had he visited Benares or Agra." It is vain to speculate. Yet one may cherish some regret that he did not visit India in the full flush of youth, and one cannot but picture him in conference with the pundits of Benares in his mature age. It is not readily credible that the results would not have been remarkable and suggestive.

Max Müller's special and formal attempt to place before English readers "The Six Systems of Indian Philosophy" may not be complete or so precise as a technical student of philosophy would have made it. He himself acknowledges as much. Still, for popular purposes, his charming handling of the salient points may be even more effective. At any rate it is no little thing that a man of such literary influence should have expressly declared: "It is in the Walhalla of real philosophers that I claim a place of honour for the representatives of the Vedânta and Sâ*m*khya." And again: "I hope that my book may prove useful to the new class of Native students by showing them in what direction they may best assist us in our attempts to secure a place to thinkers such as Kapila and Bâdarâya*n*a by the side of the leading philosophers of Greece, Rome, Germany, France, Italy, and England." And surely it is a striking and important thing that such a man should have boldly vindicated the philosophers of India from the ignorant charge of intellectual cowardice, and asserted unambiguously their simple allegiance to truth. He writes:—

> What I admire in Indian philosophers is that they never try to deceive us as to their principles and the consequences of their theories. If they are idealists, even to the verge of nihilism, they say so; and if they hold that the objective world requires a real, though not necessarily a visible or tangible substratum, they are never afraid to speak out. They are *bonâ fide* idealists or materialists, monists or dualists, theists or atheists, because their reverence for truth is stronger than their reverence for anything else. The Vedântist, for instance, is a fearless idealist, and, as a monist, denies the reality of anything but the *one* Brahman, the Universal Spirit, which is to account for the whole of the phenomenal world. The followers of the Sâ*m*khya, on the contrary, though likewise idealists and believers in an unseen Purusha (subject) and an unseen Prak*r*iti (objective substance), leave us in no doubt that they are, and mean to be, atheists, so far as the existence of an active God, a maker and ruler of the world, is concerned. They do not allow themselves to be driven one inch beyond their self chosen position. They first examine the instruments of knowledge which man possesses. These are sensuous perception, inference, and verbal authority, and as none of these can supply us with the knowledge of a Supreme Being, as a personal creator and ruler of the world, Kapila never refers to Him in his Sûtras. As a careful reasoner, however, he does not go so far as to say that he can prove the non-existence of such a Being, but is satisfied with stating, like Kant, that he cannot establish His existence by the ordinary channels of evidential knowledge. In neither of these statements can I discover, as others have done, any trace of intellectual cowardice, but simply a desire to abide within the strict limits of knowledge, such as is granted to human beings. . . . . We may miss the development and the dialectic eloquence with which

Plato and Hegel propound their thoughts, but we can always appreciate the perfect freedom, freshness, and downrightness with which each searcher after truth follows his track without ever looking right or left.

The high value he placed upon the Vedas Max Müller was ever ready to testify. "Whatever the Vedas may be called," he writes, "they are to us unique and priceless guides in opening before our eyes tombs of thought richer in relics than the royal tombs of Egypt, and more ancient and primitive in thought than the oldest hymns of Babylonian or Accadian poets." Admitting that the Vedânta might tend, as a popular philosophy, to weaken the practical side of life, he yet says:—

At the same time I make no secret that all my life I have been very fond of the Vedânta. Nay, I can fully agree with Schopenhauer and quite understand what he meant when he said: "In the whole world there is no study, except that of the original (of the Upanishads), so beneficial and so elevating as that of the Oupnekhat (Persian translation of the Upanishads). It has been the solace of my life, it will be the solace of my death."

If Max Müller did not go to the East the East went much to him. On previous occasions we have referred to his charming notices of some of the more prominent religious reformers and scholars that have come over here from the East and visited him at Oxford. Surely during the past half century there has been no literary influence comparable to that of Max Müller in bringing East and West together on a common platform of the highest interests and the deepest sympathies.

THE ENQUIRY INTO THE GUZERAT REVENUE COLLECTIONS.

The very remarkable evidence collected by Mr. Gokuldas Parekh—evidence tending to show that the people have been grievously oppressed in the collection of the revenue—has at last forced the Bombay Government to abandon the attitude of indifference which they had previously maintained. They have granted the enquiry they had so long refused. So far the courage and industry of Mr. Parekh has had its reward. But there are certain circumstances connected with this enquiry which have led many to view it with suspicion and to doubt whether much good will come of it. In the first place, there is a very strong opinion that the choice of Mr. Maconochie to conduct the enquiry is unfortunate. This does not imply any inclination to belittle the good qualities of that gentleman, to deny his intellectual powers, or in any way to doubt his earnest desire to arrive at the truth and the whole truth. But Mr. Maconochie has been Under-Secretary to the Government of India in the Department of Revenue and Agriculture. He will naturally be inclined to look at the case from the point of view of revenue; and it is not a question of revenue but of fact. There is a very strong feeling that the enquiry should have been committed to a Judge of the High Court alone. Mr. Maconochie is a junior official, and he will have to report on what has occurred in districts under the authority of men senior to himself. He has not been a judge, and he will have to conduct an enquiry essentially judicial, and depending for its success greatly on his power of sifting and weighing evidence. Moreover, he is probably more liable than a Judge of the High Court would be—even though drawn from the ranks of the Civil Service—to that natural feeling of *esprit de corps* which leads Indian Civilians insensibly to discredit evidence which tells against other members of that distinguished body; and although directly the charges bear on the inferior servants of Government, yet it may be that some indirect blame will rest on their superiors—some suspicion of laxity in supervision or indifference to complaint. On all these grounds the Indian public have been deeply disappointed at the choice of Mr. Maconochie.

There is another objection which has been taken to the Government Resolution, and one which, if well founded, would be even more damaging. It contains these words:—

The enquiry will be in public, any person concerned being permitted to have the assistance of a pleader or recognised agent, and the proceedings being judicial, oaths or affirmations may be administered, and false evidence will be punishable under the Penal Code.

This is interesting as an admission that the enquiry is judicial, and it strengthens the contention of those who hold that it should have been conducted by an officer of suitable judicial experience; but the last clause has been considered likely to have an intimidating effect. The timid, it is argued, will fear that any evidence controverted by those in authority will be treated as false, and that silence is safest. It is, however, impossible to believe that the Government had any such intention. The clause is a mere statement of fact. And it is to be hoped that sufficient evidence will be forthcoming.

On the whole, we are inclined to look forward to the enquiry with congratulation. Though Mr. Maconochie is not a judge, there is no reason to doubt that he will show himself a high-minded official, desirous only of arriving at the truth. We must hope that his native intelligence will to some extent supply the want of experience in the Courts of Law. The judicial temper is indeed hard to assume at a moment's notice; but if Mr. Maconochie succeeds in that difficult task, none will be more ready to do him honour than those who have been doubtful of the wisdom of his appointment. It is in any case a great advantage that the evidence should be laid before the public. If that is properly brought out, the people can judge for themselves, and even a feeble or inconclusive judgment will not suffice to render the enquiry of no avail. On these grounds we look upon the decision of the Government as a pure gain.

It may under these circumstances be not without interest to look again at the evidence already collected by Mr. Gokuldas Parekh and submitted by him to the Government of Bombay. A full list of the allegations of "Gujerati," put forward in the *Times of India*, appeared in our last issue, and it is not our intention to go over that ground again, but rather to select certain striking passages from the evidence adduced in support of the charges.

One case which has been already referred to in our columns deserves a more particular statement. In the village of Obha there lives a cultivator named Lala Mava. Some thirteen months ago he was in arrears with the assessment of his land to the extent of Rs. 20 out of a rent of Rs. 50. Now one day as he was ploughing his uncle's field in company with his uncle's son, a Karkun accompanied by three other persons came up and seized him and four oxen yoked to the plough. The oxen belonged to his uncle who owed nothing to the Government, but for explaining this Lala Mava was beaten with a stick. Then a mill-stone was placed on his back and he was kept in a stooping position for half-an-hour. This combination of cruelty and illegality was successful. The uncle, though he owed nothing, sold his ornaments and paid his nephew's dues, and thus got back his own oxen. But if this story be true, what brutality and injustice may be perpetrated under British rule.

Another case shows the continuous and widespread distress in some villages. The statement is made by Bhana Koya, of Kathodra, a Revenue and Police Patel for about nine years, and therefore not a man to blame lightly those in authority. The Patel tells us that the crops failed partially in 1897, and to a greater extent in 1898 and 1899. In the first year the moveable property of seven or eight men was ordered to be seized in consequence of the non-payment of Government dues, but in the latter years the moveables of *all* the rayats were seized. "All the household articles such as food grains, wearing apparel, turmeni, salt, chillies and such other condiments, baskets, brooms, mortars, pestles, cooking utensils, etc., were seized." If any were absent, their houses were broken open. Eleven landowners were driven out of their houses with their families and the doors locked and barred against them: and in some cases the bars remained for over two months. Bhana Koya himself was granted this year Rs. 50 as *takavi* to purchase grass; but of this Rs. 30 were deducted on account of Government dues, and he only received Rs. 20. Four others in the village had the same experience. He adds that out of twenty head of cattle which he possessed, seventeen have died this year and only three are left. If, then, the statement of the Patel be true, and it is made by a responsible person, we find that far from the distress being a product of this year only, the people of his village had been in difficulties for many years, that the arrears had been collected with the utmost rigour, even clothes and cooking utensils being seized, that many were driven out of their homes, and that the *takavi* given to purchase fodder was in great part seized for rent before it ever reached the cultivators. What wonder, then, that the cattle died! But is it not absurd for a benevolent Government thus to give with its right hand what it takes away with its left?

Here and there among the statements we come across curious instances of the effects of the rigorous enforcement of assessments. Bhima Prag of Takarma originally held with his brother 65 bhijas of land. But it had to be sold bit by bit to pay the Government dues till now he has only 10 bhijas and his brother 7½. By this means he had till now managed to pay his dues regularly. But this year he made default and accordingly his household goods were attached. They consisted of a stone hand mill, a pot for cooking, a brass water pot and a cart. One day as he was going to his field with nothing on except a loin-cloth and a cloth round his head, he heard that the Deputy Collector Saheb had come to the village. Accordingly he hurried off to complain of the harsh treatment he had received. But he gained nothing thereby; for he and the other defaulters were ordered to stand apart, and after being kept there for two or three hours, they were taken to Olpad, and only released after dark, having passed the whole day without food.

Such is the story of Bhima Prag. In the same village Fakira Bhana experienced the same treatment and was frightened into borrowing sufficient to pay the dues from a money-lender at a ruinous rate of interest; and we know on the best official authority that the money-lenders are the ruin of the Indian peasantry. But this is only one example of the straits to which the rayats were put; of how they borrowed, of how they even sold such fodder as they had left, and thus lost their cattle. Compared with this, being struck and whipped for non-payment was probably considered a trivial calamity. The whole body of statements, 48 in number, throw a wonderful light on the position of the peasantry in Guzerat. If they are true, they contain a most damaging case against the Administration; and they show how necessary is an immediate, a full, and an impartial enquiry.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

WESTMINSTER, Thursday.

WHETHER Lord Salisbury has any further surprise in store for the British public remains to be seen. In any event, he can scarcely hope to better the master-stroke which was announced to a startled world yesterday morning. That the Prime Minister might cease to be Foreign Secretary or that the Foreign Secretary might sever himself from the Prime Minister was at one time thought to be a not improbable sequel of the General Election, and the contemplation of so desirable a contingency was only abandoned when the leading Conservative organ, with every appearance of authority and high inspiration, solemnly announced last Saturday that Lord Salisbury had irrevocably determined to continue in the dual *rôle*. Not the wildest of speculators in political gossip had ventured to dream of what seems actually to have happened. Had anyone suggested a week ago that Lord Lansdowne was about to succeed Lord Salisbury as Foreign Secretary he would have been laughed at as a lunatic. Nevertheless, it is this incredible thing that is said to have been done. Lord Salisbury never devised a more audacious stroke of sardonic humour. The appointment has really a good deal to recommend it, but in the meanwhile the amazed and exasperated censors of the War Office are predicting a retributive cataclysm.

At the time of writing the question of other changes in the Cabinet is still in the region of speculative rumour. Lord Selborne, who enjoys the advantage of being the Prime Minister's son-in-law, is said to have set his heart on the War Office, but there is also a curious report in circulation to the effect that the Duke of Devonshire may sacrifice his *otium cum dignitate* as Lord President of the Council to take up the more onerous and less exalted duties of the post. When Lord Salisbury went to Balmoral the other week, he probably asked the Queen to accept his resignation as Prime Minister, on the understanding that he should retain the seals of the Foreign Office. His heart is undoubtedly in the work of this great department, and it is understood that he will continue to give it his constant supervision.

At last the elections are over. The final act of the tragi-comedy formed a fitting climax to a strange, perplexing drama. Orkney and Shetland, for the first time in their electoral history, have returned a Unionist, thus increasing the Ministerial majority in Scotland to four and in Parliament to 134. Why Ultima Thule should have reversed its political traditions in this manner it would be difficult to say. Sir Leonard Lyell, the defeated candidate, had represented the constituency for fifteen years, and his majorities have never been less than seven hundred. He is a Liberal of the Whiggish type, and was reckoned by the Imperialists as one of themselves. Perhaps a more robust Radicalism would have saved the seat. In those remote isles, however, the larger issues of politics play a comparatively trifling part. Some local or personal prejudice probably decided the election. Sir Leonard Lyell had treated the archipelago as a safe seat, whereas his opponent, Mr. Wason, had strenuously cultivated the suffrages of every inhabited rock. Mr. Wason's brother is also in Parliament. He sits on the Liberal side as member for Clackmannan.

Judging from the reproaches and recriminations that have been flying about this week, London is beginning to get a little tired of its debauches of militarism. We are now in the soda-water stage. Nevertheless, it is rather unfortunate that our fit of remorse should have been reserved for the celebrations organised in honour of the return of the City Imperial Volunteers. Those gallant fellows deserved a warm yet dignified welcome, but what they got was a volcanic deluge, followed by a prodigious exhibition of temper on the part of their hosts. It was a reception of which the magnitude, the enthusiasm, the violence and the blunders were alike barbaric. To begin with, Britannia was so confident in her supremacy over the waves that she made no allowance for turbulent seas, with the result that the troopship conveying the home-coming troops was still labouring in the trough of the ocean when London had begun its revels. One day having been wasted in suspense and irrelevant dissipation, a second day was allowed to slip by in idleness because it happened to be Sunday, and then on Monday the pent-up emotions which had thus been artificially stimulated were let loose, and swept the great city from end to end with the genial fury of a whirlwind.

Patriotism, said Dr. Johnson, is the last refuge of a scoundrel. Many scoundrels have lately found in it the first of refuges and the most convenient of cloaks. Their method is to sally forth on any occasion of public rejoicing and take to the highway, not with a revolver or a bludgeon but simply with a peacock's feather or a squirt. With one or other of those instruments the new highwayman blinds or tickles his victims in the name of patriotism, and while the latter are trying to reconcile their dignity to the humour of the performance an accomplice deftly picks their pockets. Pocket-picking, unfortunately, is no novel incident of a London holiday, but we owe it to the opportunities suggested by the memorable Mafeking carnival that the pickpockets and other rascals are now enabled, so to speak, to pluck their victims of their feathers as methodically as a shepherd shears his flock. Fortunately, the magistrates have begun to realise the dangers of these wild saturnalia, and the plea of patriotism is no longer accepted as an excuse even by the organs of the Jingoes. It is to be hoped that this revulsion of feeling in favour of a return to sane and seemly methods of festivity may not have run its course before Lord Mayor's Day.

When ex-President Kruger reaches Europe he will find that the absorption of the two Boer Republics in the British Empire has been notified to the Powers, and that in the eyes of the French and other Governments, he himself has no longer an official existence. But he will also learn that the war is still in progress. Indeed the "marauding bands" of which Lord Roberts spoke so opportunely on the eve of the election appear to be giving our troops plenty of occupation. Their activity and ubiquity are amazing. On our part, although the war has been "practically over" for about three months, we have still as large an army in the field as ever, and week by week we are continuing to send out reinforcements. Lord Roberts has intimated that he hopes to leave for England about the middle of this month. Military critics declare that his work will not be done till next January.

Profound sympathy is everywhere felt with the Queen and her daughter Princess Christian in the bereavement which they have suffered by the death at Pretoria of Prince Christian Victor. This young Prince to whose brave and amiable character the Queen has just paid a touching personal tribute had seen much active service, and perhaps had a premonition of his death in South Africa, for before going he had directed that in the event of his decease he should be buried where he

fell. He had seen Prince Henry of Battenberg die in another part of the great African continent, when he himself was recovering from the fever, a recurrence of which in the Transvaal was eventually to prove fatal. Death has exacted a heavy toll from the Queen's domestic circle this year. The Court, indeed, has scarcely been out of mourning for a day.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

MR. PAREKH'S ALLEGATIONS.

THE NATURE OF THE ENQUIRY.

HOSTILE CRITICISM.

[From an Indian Correspondent.]

Bombay, October 13.

The most important news of the week is the appointment of Mr. E. Maconochie, of the Bombay Civil Service, a junior, to enquire into the several allegations made by the Hon. Mr. Gokuldas K. Parekh and referred to in my Notes of last week. No doubt the array of cases of tyrannous practices in vogue in the collection of land revenue in some of the localities in the Surat and Broach districts, in Gujerat, cited by that indefatigable gentleman, left no alternative to the Bombay Government but to verify the categorical statements so openly made. That entity sowed the wind and it is now bound to reap the whirlwind. But, whatever the result of the investigation may be, there is a strong feeling among the enlightened Native community as to the position of the person nominated to carry on the enquiry. It has not approved of it. Even the Anglo-Indian journals have only given their qualified and guarded assent to it. In fact, reading between the lines, it is not difficult to discern their grave doubts as to the enquiry being thoroughly judicial and free from departmental bias. This is the prominent defect of the appointment. Whatever Mr. Maconochie's ability may be as a revenue officer, it is idle to expect that he can conduct the enquiry in the impartial spirit which might be expected from an experienced judge of the High Court. Moreover, how in the very nature of things can one expect a junior to sit in judgment on the action of his seniors? He cannot be taken in any sense as an officer of years and experience. He has failed to inspire public confidence, and the Native public have been ominously shaking their heads as to what the result of the enquiry will ultimately be. In fact, it is already hinted that it will be one of those "make-believe" investigations with which they are too familiar.

Neither Mr. Maconochie's position nor his experience entitles him to be a judge in these matters, where the essential points to be sifted are *facts*. The points have nothing to do with revenue. The issue to be decided is whether the facts of irregularity, oppression, and what not, brought to light by Mr. Gokuldas, are accurate or not. A strong judicial knowledge is necessary, and an independent and impartial judge of the High Court was essential if the Bombay Government is really in earnest and honest enough to be judged at the bar of a public tribunal. Of course, all the show and form of publicity are there. But they look like mere blinds and none is deceived. The cloven hoof of the Revenue Member may be discerned in that part of the Resolution which threatens pains and penalties to witnesses. The meaning of that is obvious enough. It is calculated to frighten willing witnesses from coming forward and giving evidence before the Sirkar. The Resolution tells such witnesses somewhat in the manner following:—Beware how you give your evidence. Heaven forbid that you should speak againt the Sirkar, however truthful. The Sirkar will see what becomes of you at the close of the enquiry. Now we consider this kind of threat to be not only unworthy of a Government which is willing to enquire openly into the actions of its subordinates and underlings, but opposed to the very object of the enquiry. Enquiry by intimidation is simply another form of the Inquisition. Mr. Maconochie's Court, it is feared, may resemble a masked Inquisition Chamber. I, for one, therefore, with many others, already give up all hope of this new Revenue Star Chamber which has not even the merits of judicial form about it, much less of inspiring confidence in its impartiality. In India the civilians are a caste by themselves. They offer the strongest barrier to anyone who would castigate a member of the caste. They all remain united, and protect each other. This is the way of our white Brahmins in the Government of this country. Is it reasonable to expect, human nature being everywhere the same, and race-blood being thicker than water, that any good can come out of this caste enquiry? I shall be agreeably surprised if the result of the investigation turns out anything else than what I apprehend at present. In that case I shall be the first to say that Mr. Maconochie was indeed a Daniel come to judgment. But till that contingency occurs I refuse to pin my faith to this latest "make-believe" investigation accompanied by intimidatory monitions.

Meanwhile, the Government of India has issued a long Resolution reviewing all the papers in connexion with the revised settlement of land revenue assessments for another twenty years in the Central Provinces. The real *raison d'être* of this parading of the Resolution is evident. It is to contradict Mr. Dutt, who has condemned the assessments as excessive. Of course, this is inevitable. The Government of India in this matter is judge and jury in its own case. The public allege that its revenue enhancements are burdensome. It has to make its defence, but not to give its opinion that its defence is admirable and that it is not guilty of the public charge laid at its door. There is Mr. Dutt as prosecutor, so to say; and the Government of India is the defendant. It is a third party—an impartial judicial tribunal—which should pronounce judgment. But such is the wonderful mechanism of British Indian Administration that in matters affecting the public weal the Government itself has the last word and lays the flattering unction to its soul that there is not a flaw to be found in its administration, that everything is in perfect order, and that everything is for the best in the best of all possible Governments. Statesmen in other climes may smile at this self-complacent attitude of the British Indian Government. All the same this is the reality; and so long as this is the temper and attitude of that Government it is hopeless to expect any reform. At present the Indian Government is conscious of the fact that it is on its trial in the matter of land revenue assessments. It is, therefore, bound to hark back to its ancient traditions and stand firm by them, no matter what the cry of the populace may be. They say in an aside: Come what may, we must defend this policy of ours which brings so much grist to the mill, and which provides so many loaves and fishes for the foreign agency at the expense of the indigenous. To deviate even by a hair's breadth from that policy would be to toll its death-knell. This must be avoided at all hazard and at all cost. So here is the key to the Resolution. One must be prepared to find that the Indian Government will do its very best now to resist tooth-and-nail this land revenue agitation. Already in Bengal a certain Civilian has been put up to write against it in the columns of the *Englishman*; and one need not be surprised to see articles appearing in the English papers and magazines on this matter. So much the better. As the discussion on the two famines has made it clear, in spite of official declarations to the contrary, that it is the poverty of the land which leads to famine—the incessant drain of the national wealth to other countries—so will this discussion soon bring home to the mind of the British public that the land revenue policy of the Indian Government is another fetish which will have to be laid low in the interests of order, good government, and the contentment and happiness of people in this great country.

Lord and Lady Northcote's beneficence seems to find greater and greater scope the more they come into intimate contact with Native gentlemen. Since the arrival of this philanthropic pair in our midst, it is computed that they have most nobly given away 40,000 rupees in public charity—all on famine and cognate matters. Lately, his lordship has taken the initiative in starting a cattle-breeding farm. It does infinite credit to his heart that he has headed the fund by subscribing 10,000 rupees. Donations are now pouring in. But it is grievous to notice how our millionaires have behaved in this matter. One would have thought, in view of their deep religious sentiment and humanity about animals and their protection, that in a scheme so beneficent—an absolute necessity after the tremendous havoc among agricultural cattle in the late famine—as the one started by Lord Northcote, they would subscribe liberally. His Excellency too has put them all to shame by giving Rs.10,000. Yet those who can easily afford to give five and ten times as much have not even put down in the list one tenth of his Excellency's sum. This is not only grievous

but humiliating. The fact is deplorable and shows how little spirit of self-sacrifice these millionaires possess. Give them each a knighthood or a baronetcy and you will see how many of them will vie with each other in their donations of lakhs instead of the miserable hundreds they have doled out in famine and cattle-breeding subscriptions. I am ashamed of my countrymen in this matter.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

1,422,000 ON RELIEF.

RAIN URGENTLY WANTED.

The Secretary of State for India has received the following telegram from the Viceroy on the subject of the famine:—

Number of persons in receipt of relief:—Bombay, 499,000; Punjab, relief discontinued; Central Provinces, 625,000; Berar, 123,000; Ajmere-Merwara, 1,000; Rajputana States, 11,000; Central India States, 17,000; Bombay Native States, 50,000; Baroda, 31,000; Punjab Native States, 2,000; Central Provinces Feudatory States, 13,000; Haidarabad, 50,000.—Total, 1,422,000.

The Secretary of State has also received the following telegram from the Governor of Bombay:—

"Following are figures for week ended October 20:—Famine-stricken districts—107 cases of cholera, of which 76 were fatal. Total number of deaths among number on relief works and gratuitous relief, 1,312, or 2 3-5 per mille. Moderate rain doing appreciable good has fallen in Karnatik; elsewhere good fall of rain urgently wanted.

THE MANSION HOUSE FUND.

The Mansion House Fund for the relief of the sufferers from the Indian Famine amounted on Wednesday night to £382,600.

THE "INVESTORS' REVIEW" FUND.

We take the following from the current issue (October 27) of the *Investors' Review*:—

Subscriptions to our little fund, from which not a penny is deducted for advertisements in newspapers or any other kind of charges, may be sent to A. J. Wilson, at this office; cheques to be crossed "Union Bank of London, Indian Famine Fund."

List of Subscriptions.

	£	s.	d.
Amount acknowledged last week	£858	12	7
St. Mary's Institute, Greenwich (Offertories), per "India"	1	10	0
"Q," per "India"	0	2	6
Total to date	£860	5	1

REVENUE COLLECTIONS IN GUZERAT.

THE HON. MR. GOKULDAS PAREKH'S ALLEGATIONS.

ENQUIRY GRANTED.

The following Resolution was issued by the Government of Bombay on October 10:—

The Governor in Council has considered with attention the representations of the Hon. Mr. Gokuldas Parekh regarding the oppressive measures which are alleged to have been taken for the collection of revenue in the Anklesvar Taluka and Hansot Mahal of the Broach District and the Olpad Taluka of Surat. The anonymous statements previously made in the public Press were, in the opinion of Government, sufficiently met by the explanations offered by responsible officials with the support of the Collectors, Messrs. Panse and Weir, officers whose sympathy with the people and knowledge of their circumstances forbade the supposition that they would lend the smallest countenance to harshness of any description, much less to acts of illegality and oppression in the collection of revenue during a year of famine. The present allegations, however, stand on a different footing. Some of them relate to acts of oppression alleged to have been committed in years previous to the famine. They consist for the most part of written statements, *ex parte* it is true, but taken by the hon. member in his own handwriting or in his presence, and supported by an expression of his belief in their genuineness and veracity. A serious indictment against the character of responsible officials directly concerned in the collection of the land revenue and the efficiency of the supervision exercised over them is thus presented to the Government. In these circumstances the Governor in Council considers it incumbent on him to institute full and strictly impartial enquiries with the object of testing the accuracy of the particular statements and general allegations made as to oppressiveness and illegality in the collection of revenue in the tracts mentioned.

A Public Enquiry.

2. The Governor in Council is accordingly pleased to direct that, for the purpose of investigating the allegations contained in the Honourable Mr. Parekh's letter and appendices, a formal enquiry should be held in accordance with the provisions of Chapter XII. of the Land Revenue Code. The enquiry will be in public, any person concerned being permitted to have the assistance of a pleader or recognised agent, and the proceeding being judicial, oaths or affirmations may be administered, and false evidence will be punishable under the Penal Code. For the duty of conducting such enquiry the Governor in Council has selected Mr. E. Maconochie, I.C.S., who has been the Under-Secretary to the Government of India in the Department of Revenue and Agriculture for three years, and whose services will shortly be replaced at the disposal of this Government. Mr. Maconochie should take up the enquiry immediately on arrival, and to enable him to exercise the powers specified in the provisions of the Land Revenue Code above referred to, he is appointed Assistant to the Collector of Broach with effect from the date on which he commences the enquiry in that district, and will be appointed Assistant to the Collector of Surat with effect from a date which will be notified hereafter.

Supplementary Investigations.

3. Besides investigating and reporting on specific allegations Mr. Maconochie should be directed, with reference to paragraphs 3 (1), 11, and 13 of the Hon. Mr. Parekh's letter, to prepare on the basis of the Government records and local enquiry a statement of the condition of the Anklesvar Taluka and Hansot Mahal prior to the famine, and of the ability of the people to meet the demands for revenue made upon them in the course of the revenue year 1899-1900. He should enquire into the extent and causes of the relinquishment of land which has occurred, and state his opinion with reasons as to the inference which can be drawn from those relinquishments regarding the capacity or incapacity to pay of those persons who were pressed for payment of their revenue in the neighbourhood in which the Hon. Mr. Parekh has pursued his enquiries.

4. With reference to paragraphs 34 and 35 of the letter Mr. Maconochie should submit a statement of all the cases mentioned by the Hon. Mr. Parekh, showing in each instance (1) the amount allotted as *taccavi* or charitable relief as the case may be; (2) the date of the allotment; (3) the amount of revenue, if any, due at that date; (4) total amount of revenue due on the holding of the allottee; (5) the dates on which the revenue was paid; and (6) what reason there may be to suppose that the allotment was given or obtained with the object of recouping revenue payments previously made or paying off arrears still due.

5. The grounds for the allegation (paragraph 37 of the letter) that the man Parsotam had other lands, should be investigated and clearly stated, as also the exact facts in relation to the mortgage to Adarji mentioned in paragraph 40.

6. The Commissioner, N.D., has already been requested to report on the statements made in the case of Imperatrix v. Harilal (paragraph 17 of the letter) and accepted by the Sub-Judge Magistrate as proof of a general practice. Mr. Maconochie should, however, also investigate these statements, and report how far there is evidence of a general practice of illegal attachments.

The Rejected Petitions.

7. In communicating to Government the result of his formal investigation, Mr. Maconochie is not precluded from reporting any facts ascertained by him which bear on the general assertions made by the Honourable Mr. Parekh.

8. Mr. Maconochie's report should be submitted through the Collectors of Surat and Broach and the Commissioner, N.D., who should transmit it to Government with their remarks and comments, and a clear statement of the extent to which they accept the conclusions stated therein.

9. The Collector of Surat should be requested to explain why the joint petition to the Governor in Council referred to in paragraph 47 of the letter was withheld by him, and why he felt unable to support the recommendation that those villages which were to receive reductions of assessment according to the revised settlement which had been sanctioned by Government should receive the benefit of those reductions during the year of scarcity 1899-1900, instead of waiting for them until the formal introduction of the revised rates from the commencement of the revenue year 1900-1901.

10. The Commissioner, N.D., should be requested to report in what manner the petitions of the Bohora cultivator referred to in paragragh 45 of the Honourable Mr. Parekh's letter were disposed

of, and whether there is any reason to fear that the sale of the petitioner's bullock was not justified in the circumstances. The Honourable Mr. Lely should also report on the statement in paragraph 15 of the letter that two of the people of Bhadol went to him to complain of ill-treatment by Government servants.

11. This Resolution should be placed on the editor's table, and a copy of it should be forwarded to the Honourable Mr. Parekh.

Commenting on this Resolution, the *Times of India* writes :—

The Government of Bombay have done an unquestionably right thing in submitting the allegations contained in the Hon. Mr. Gokuldas Parekh's letter to formal enquiry, and their action will be approved of by everybody. Two exceptions will perhaps be raised to the form which is to be given to the investigation. One is that it would have been well if an officer of strictly judicial experience had been associated with Mr. Evan Maconochie in the enquiry. And the other is that by making him, for the purposes of the enquiry, an assistant to the Collectors of Broach and Surat, the Government have not been as careful as perhaps they might have been to ensure his ostensible, as well as his essential, independence. The explanation, no doubt, is that by thus attaching Mr. Maconochie to the two collectorates they make him an officer competent under Section 189 of the Revenue Code to conduct a formal enquiry under the conditions prescribed by the Penal Code. But we cannot forget that the responsibility of the district officers is *prima facie* involved in some of the allegations that will be under enquiry, and it would have been well if the anomaly we have indicated—though we admit it may be more formal than practical—had been avoided. These considerations apart, the prompt action which the Government have taken will be cordially approved of. They now recognise the seriousness of the allegations which have been made against the revenue administration of some of the Guzerat districts, and in laying down the outlines of the enquiry they give evidence of a just consciousness of the importance of the issues involved. No narrow limitations have been imposed upon the enquiring officer, for in addition to the specific allegations of oppression which constitute the principal portion of Mr. Gokuldas's indictment, the condition of the people in the localities concerned and their ability to meet the revenue demand in normal times is to be enquired into. The lines of investigation are broad enough as well as specific enough to fully meet the requirements of the case, and the Government have made an excellent choice in the selection of the officer deputed to conduct the enquiry.

The *Morning Leader* wrote (October 31) :—The famine in India is by no means over. There are still a million and a half on relief, and last week in the famine-stricken districts of the Bombay Presidency there were no fewer than 1,312 deaths. Yet to-day, it would appear, the Mansion House Fund is to be closed, for reasons that must be supposed to seem adequate to those who are acting upon them. Our Bombay Correspondent in a recent telegram informed the public that the Government of Bombay had appointed an officer, armed with judicial powers, to enquire into the truth of Mr. Parekh's allegations regarding the employment of improper and oppressive practices to help the collection of land revenue. That enquiry of any kind should have been granted is a somewhat unusual concession. But we gather alike from the Anglo-Indian and the Indian journals which the last mail has brought that there is much dissatisfaction with the proposed mode of enquiry. The Court is to consist of a junior revenue official, who will thus be asked to sit in judgment upon his seniors, and the Government resolution upon the matter is not free from phrases which seem to menace witnesses. Mr. Parekh's evidence, however, is much too substantial and direct to be lightly dismissed. Meantime, the new Famine Commission is being discussed. The test of the Government's sincerity and courage will be the answer to the question, Do the terms of reference permit enquiry into the economic causes of famine, as distinguished from amendment of the system of relief?

MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI ON ENGLAND'S DUTY.

We take the following from the *Croydon Advertiser* of October 27 :—

At the Croydon Labour Church last Sunday night, at Tamworth Road Hall, a very practical and interesting address was given on "England's Duty in the Present Indian Famine and for the Future." The lecturer, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, a native of India, said that considering the amount of India's wealth drawn every year (£30,000,000), and also the millions appropriated for maintaining the Indian Empire, which, combined, were the real causes of the extreme poverty and destitution, it was the duty of Britain to pay the costs of all famines and diseases caused by such impoverishment out of her own pocket. A resolution was passed embodying the principal points in the lecture and the chairman was instructed to send it to the Prime Minister, and also the member for Croydon, Mr. Ritchie.

THE PROPOSED NATIONAL GRANT.

The *Newcastle Leader* writes (October 23) :—There can be little doubt that the awful misery of the famine in India has been greatly increased by the refusal of the Imperial Government to make any grant in aid. The relief of the famine-stricken districts has largely been left to the efforts of private individuals and charitable associations. Lord Curzon, in a recent speech, gave very great credit to the Government of India for the way in which it has grappled with the famine. Yet, according to his statistics, over a quarter of the population of India has been affected, and 500,000 deaths have taken place, while £50,000,000 worth of crops and millions of cattle have been lost. There is little doubt that the Governor-General and his staff have worked hard and unselfishly to alleviate the misery, but they only represent the executive portion of the Indian Government. A large part of the Indian work is done at the India Office in London, and it cannot be forgotten that Lord George Hamilton delayed the opening of an Indian Famine Fund at the Mansion House until the famine had almost reached its worst phase. He must be included in the term "Indian Government," and when that is remembered it can scarcely be admitted that Lord Curzon's praise of the Government is justified. The duties of Empire and the "together we stand, divided we fall" cry have had great prominence on Tory platforms at the recent elections, but the Government which has raised that cry could not see its way to help a weak, impoverished member of the Empire, though it could afford to give lavish doles to its own friends in England.

The *Leeds Mercury* (October 25) said :—A note which appeared in this column on Monday regarding the famine in India has roused the frenzy of the Tory *Globe*, which charges the *Leeds Mercury* with uttering the "lie political," with indulging in "party fabrication," with publishing "Radical falsehoods." In commenting on Lord Curzon's appalling statement that the famine in India has caused 500,000 deaths, and has affected one-quarter of the whole population of the Dependency, we acknowledged the praiseworthy efforts made by the Viceroy and his subordinates to relieve distress. At the same time we said :—

> It is impossible to acquit the Home Government of indifference to a calamity which Lord Curzon justly says cannot be met with a sigh or dismissed with a shudder. If the British Empire is an organic unity, it surely is the duty of the strong members to lend assistance to the weak. This obligation was urged upon the Imperial Government, but they treated the matter in a spirit the reverse of sympathetic, maintaining, in effect, that it is the duty of India to bear her own burdens, even if one-fourth of her people are starving. The refusal to contribute anything from the Imperial Exchequer for the relief of our fellow-subjects in India suffering from one of the most appalling famines recorded in modern history is perhaps what might be expected of a Ministry that bestows upon its political supporters at home doles amounting to over three millions yearly. What if 500,000 Hindu rayats die of starvation, so long as English landlords and parsons flourish!

In an article headed "Those Eternal Verities," the *Globe* denounces our charge against the Government as being based on lies, falsehoods, and fabrications, and declares that monetary assistance to India was never "refused" by the Ministry, which "was not only willing, but even anxious, to saddle the white man with some of the black man's burden."

Although the *Globe* claims a monopoly of truth as well as of patriotism, the one claim is as baseless as the other. Its charge against the *Leeds Mercury* of uttering lies, fabrications, and falsehoods is easily disposed of. In the debate on the Indian Budget in the House of Commons on July 26 last, after Lord George Hamilton's annual statement, Mr. Souttar, the Liberal member for the Dumfries Burghs, moved this resolution :—

> That, looking to the special needs of the famine-stricken people in India at the present time, this House recognises that funds are urgently required to feed, clothe, and house the cultivators in their villages until their crops are ripe; to provide them with plough cattle, seed, and other requisites of cultivation; and to restore them to their normal economic condition; that these requirements cannot be adequately met from Indian revenues raised from the suffering Indian people, and within the necessarily restricted field of ordinary relief operations; that the funds subscribed by charity are altogether insufficient for these purposes; and this House is therefore of opinion that a large and generous Imperial grant should be provided to assist in meeting this unprecedented calamity.

When this motion, the proposal in which was supported by Sir Henry Fowler, was made, what happened? The Chancellor of the Exchequer rose and denounced the proposal as "a most dangerous precedent," declaring that "if there be one duty more than another incumbent on the Government of India it is to provide beforehand for serious famines of this kind."

THE PUNJAB LAND ALIENATION ACT.

The *Manchester Guardian* of Tuesday last (October 30) printed an article upon "Land Alienation in the Punjab," by its late Special Correspondent in the famine districts. In the course of the article Mr. Vaughan Nash wrote :—

The great mass of instructed Indian opinion is, I should say, either opposed to the bill or highly sceptical as to its results. Indian reformers are growing tired of the chops and changes and caprices that have characterised the handling of the land question, and many of them are inclined to see in the new reform an empirical remedy prescribed in a hurry for a highly complex disorder for which the Government of India is itself responsible. There are indeed others who welcome the measure as an indication that the Government are frankly revising the whole fabric of British institutions in the light of their closer knowledge of the genius of the country, and who regard the reversion to the old order of things as a sign of a more sympathetic and instructed policy. This view seems to me to be justified by the facts, but it is not the general one, and against it must be set not only the prejudices of the school which I have mentioned, but the immensely powerful and capable group of interests represented by the Indian traders and financiers, whose growing hold on the land is threatened by the new measure. They regard the bill as a piece of confiscation and a highly disturbing and unsettling factor, and when one considers that land is, after all, the one great Indian investment it is easy to believe that their fears are sincerely felt. . . . .

These dry bones of the Act can hardly live for the English reader unless he bears in mind two things. First there is the helplessness of the average Indian cultivator in his capacity of party to a contract which makes of him a very sheep when he comes to the money-lender to be shorn. The other is the peculiar form of blindness which afflicts the Goddess of Justice whom we have installed in India. The goddess, in truth, requires no eyes. She has only to put the seal on the money-lender's bond and down come the scales in his favour. The contract may be of the most unconscionable description, a combination of forgery, roguery, and rapacity ; but a bond is a bond—the law allows it and the Court awards it. Out of 742 peasant families of Punjab mortgagors whose financial histories have been ascertained, in only thirteen cases was complete release achieved. Of 3,715 mortgage deeds examined the conditions were such as to make redemption hopeless. I have before me a long and tragical list of these conditions which the borrower has no option but to accept, and which the law has never questioned. That this devil's league should at length be broken seems to me to be an event of good hope for India. It shows, at any rate, that we can count on that high form of public courage in the rulers of India which is not deterred from doing the right thing because it involves an admission and expiation of past mistakes. It may of course be argued, and it is so argued in India, that it would have been sufficient to raise the bandage from the eyes of Justice, instead of thrusting her off her pedestal in this unceremonious fashion. But is there any real foundation for such a view ? To admit the wisdom of enabling the magistrate to go behind the bond is one thing—and few people would deny that this was a most necessary reform—but it does not follow that the law can keep the money-lender in order, or protect the cultivator, or check the alienation of land, merely because a discretionary power is conferred upon the magistrate. If it comes to a tug-of-war between courts and money-lenders—courts, I mean, which enjoy the power of setting aside unconscionable bonds—the money-lender can give an amazing account of himself, and be quite equal on occasion to the task of throwing the court on its back. Nor is this a matter of conjecture. For many years past an Act has been in operation in a part of the Bombay Deccan which was framed with the precise object of protecting the cultivators from the more extreme forms of extortion. Opinions differ greatly as to the effects of this law upon the people. A recent Commission expresses the view that their position has been considerably strengthened, that they are less indebted, and that the practice of seizure of crops by the money-lender has been greatly diminished. On the other hand, a judge who had formerly administered the Act told me that in his opinion the debtor's position was not so greatly improved, and that the money-lenders were able to work their way round to their old profits by different roads. Their debtors might pay less interest, but they would make good the difference in rent, and to get this rent the mortgage would in effect be converted into a sale, with the debtor as tenant. Some authorities, I must add, deny that the increase of alienation in the Deccan is due to the Act ; but about the fact of the increase itself there is no doubt whatever. A member of the Commission to which I have just alluded told me that in his opinion the lines laid down by the Punjab legislation were the only ones by which the cultivator could be effectively protected, and I am bound to say that the whole of my observations confirmed his view.

As to the question of credit, it is quite true that the cultivator in the Punjab will have much less rope to play with. So much the better for him, considering the conditions under which that rope is paid out. The system of credit is a snare and a stumbling-block, and anything is better—even a period of stringency—than the indefinite continuance of a system which is annihilating the old cultivating tribes of India. If this should come about, the system of Government advances must be extended, or a serious effort must be made to set agricultural credit banks on foot. But it is quite possible that nothing dreadful will happen. It is only a few years since the cultivator was enabled to mortgage his lands at all, and under the new arrangement he will still be better off as a purchaser of credit than he used to be.

"BLEEDING INDIA."

In the course of a somewhat extreme article in the *Positivist Review* for November, which concludes with the remarkable suggestion that "speedy arrangements should be made for winding up our affairs in India," Mr. Alfred Haggard (brother of the novelist) puts some sound points forcibly and well. We give some passages from his article, profoundly as we dissent from his main conclusion :—

From time to time thinkers have attacked our Indian system ; they have pointed out the immorality of the conquest and occupation of the country, and its subjection solely for the pecuniary benefit of the conquerors. They have shown that the days for such conquests have gone by, from the point of view of the benefit of either conquerors or conquered. They have pointed out that the civilisations of East and West clash and injure each other without any corresponding benefit to either side. And they have urged England for such theoretic reasons to withdraw from an immoral and odious position. Their advice has been met merely with neglect or contempt. Others from time to time, as one unjust war after another is waged, as one unjust annexation after another is perpetrated, have protested against these wars and these annexations. They have shown in pamphlets and publications that the expense is not justified by any benefit to India itself. The annexations were of course an outrage to India, the wars were mainly outside her borders, and their object was not to protect India so much as the English rulers of India. Sometimes there was not even this excuse. The Abyssinian war had nothing to do with India. The conquest of Burmah was mainly prompted by jealousy of the French. The wars in Afghanistan were caused by jealousy of the Russians. All such representations have been unavailing. Unjust and useless wars and annexations continue. And the map is now painted red from the confines of Persia to the far remote boundaries of Siam.

Some of these writers while admitting the immorality of the whole procedure have pointed out its inevitable result in the pauperisation of the people. Some inkling of such a probability has even reached the minds of those responsible for the government of the country, and they have not been behindhand with a remedy, which they were the more ready to employ as they saw in it a method for benefiting themselves. It is as though the one suffering from an incurable complaint should consult the inventor of a patent medicine for a remedy. Naturally the quack recommends his nostrum. And the British capitalist ruler was ready with his. The construction of railways, canals, and other public works was to increase the commercial advantages of India and, when new annexations afforded no more fresh sources of revenue, to come to the rescue with increased production of materials to make good the loss inflicted by disastrous and expensive wars and military administration ; by excessive expenditure on civil administration ; by heavy interest on loans contracted to meet current charges, the interest of which was guaranteed by the State ; and by the enormously heavy burden of the Home Charges. The capital for these railways and works was found in Europe ; the interest had to go back there. The railways formed so many conduits for exporting the very means of subsistence of the people, and they therefore have been a double source of loss to the people of India ; first of all they carried away their means of livelihood, and, secondly, the people have to be taxed to pay the interest upon public works which are useless for their welfare.

Doubtless there were famines in India before the British *raj* ; but there is no record of any one equal in intensity to those which have lately occurred ; the worst was in Bengal, a province which, owing probably to the permanent settlement of the land revenue there, has been comparatively free from this scourge of late years, as the people have been able, owing to far lighter taxation than elsewhere enforced, to retain a little of the wealth which they toilsomely produce. Famine is the gift of the British to India ; it is the return given for careers for her sons in the civil and the military services, for the pride of power and conquest, for the pensions of retired officers, their widows and children, for guaranteed interest on railways and other works, for regularly paid interest on Government loans. To meet the taxation involved, the cultivator must pay in cash, whereas formerly he paid in kind ; to find the cash he must sell his produce at market rates, and thus, the taxation being excessive, his stocks have been gradually depleted, and when a short rainfall occurs millions must starve. An elaborate machinery has been invented to enforce the payment of debts even at exorbitant rates of interest, which the necessities of the cultivator compel his entering into, whereby he perhaps delays for a little the moment when he and his family must die of hunger. What the poverty of the Natives of India is may be judged by this fact. Lord Cromer, then Major Baring, in his budget

speech in 1882, said :—"In England the average income per head of population was £33; in France it was £23; in Turkey, which was the poorest country of Europe, it was £4." "It was calculated that the average income per head of population in India was not more than 27 rupees a year." Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji can only make out an income per head of 20 rupees per annum!

When it is remembered that in addition to the native army an army of about 70,000 Europeans is kept in India, that every well paid public appointment is filled by an European, that the natives are practically excluded from any high place in the administration, that the wars are all embarked in for the purposes of the English Government, it will not be wondered at if the charges of ordinary administration are exorbitantly high. But this is by no means all; the home-charges amount to about sixteen millions yearly on official account alone, but, besides these, there are remitted to Europe in one year somewhere about fourteen millions, in all about thirty millions of money without any return whatever. This is the tribute of India to England; it is this outflow of capital which is bleeding India to death. Thirty millions yearly are sent out of a country where the average income per head of the population is not more than 27 rupees each year to a country where the average is £33. Will not such figures as these come home to our people and make them realise that if India is not ruined already it soon must be? No country can ever possibly withstand a drain of this kind for ever. If the population are forced to give their life-blood to meet it, then they must die—and they *are* dying. Indeed, they have already been ruined; but still many thousands of Europeans are living in indolent luxury on the spoils which are thus being extorted from India, under the influence of a devoted Civil Service recruited from the flower of the English Universities, many of whose number think that they are devoting their zealous lives to a splendid cause, whereas they are acting with a crushing force that Roman "publicans" would have been almost ashamed of and which British Pharisaism applauds. By the late currency juggle the taxation of the people has been further enhanced to meet the increase of salaries of the officials.

The end of course must come. One day India will be unable to further endure the strain. Our rulers should take up the task of meeting the not very distant disaster to England, which they have omitted to meet in respect of India. India we say is ruined; when whole classes in England have also been ruined, perhaps our Government will bestir itself. The demoralisation of one of the most influential portions of English society no one seems to think anything about. Yet the aggressive spirit, blatant Imperialism, military adventure, the conquest and oppression of other conquered peoples are all encouraged by the classes who feed and batten on this unprecedented spoliation. And they lend their support to a bastard horde of capitalists, who embark on financial speculations that they would never otherwise take up, relying on the power and the goodwill of the English people to enforce their extortionate demands and to guarantee this otherwise unpayable interest. The working-classes of England have slight profit from this usury. The capital misapplied in India could all be profitably employed in England. It might perhaps obtain a less rate of interest: that disadvantage the working-classes would hardly feel. The ruin that will one day come when the huge bubble bursts will be felt even by the proletaries who are meanwhile deprived of the benefit of capital they themselves have accumulated.

"AN EMPIRE ADRIFT."

Mr. Vaughan Nash contributes to the November number of the *Contemporary Review*, under this heading, an extremely interesting and valuable article upon the position in India. Having shown the necessity of large reforms (especially in the matter of land revenue, debt disputes, and the apportionment of burdens between India and the United Kingdom), Mr. Nash concludes as follows :—

It is a waste of paper to discuss these large reforms unless we are to assume some change at least of spirit in the military form and tone of government which is bound up with the confusion, cross purposes, and oppression which characterise the policy of drift. Once admit that we are going to govern India for the Indians—a policy which I have ventured to suggest is rendered imperative by the plight to which the rayat has been reduced, and which on grounds alike of self-interest and of mercy is irresistible—and the orthodox attitude of aloofness and infallibility becomes a trifle pointless. Some system of co-operation between people and governors will clearly have to be devised, if only that Government may acquaint itself with the position and opinions of the people and the best means of helping them. I met in India more than one official who held most strongly that in any case some method of representation was indispensable. Before the days of secretariat rule and government by system, the people could always appeal to the district officer, who had a pretty free hand in meeting out rough and ready justice. But now, when laws are made over the head of the district officer, laws which right or wrong he must carry out, there is virtually no appeal. The officer may be well aware that the system is working harshly, but he can only tell the suppliant who comes to him for redress that the injustice of which he complains is strictly legal. Again, the time of the district officer is so taken up with office work that he cannot, if he would, know what is going on in the district, or properly acquaint the Government with the state of popular opinion. Lord Curzon's effort to cut down office work will do something, but it will not meet the case. Give the people some form of consultative institution to which all measures which directly concern them shall be brought, and you put the position of Government and that of the district officer on a far securer and more satisfactory basis. The villagers know their own minds on a good many subjects, and are competent to express them, and on others where they cannot see so far ahead they will trust the man who wins their confidence. It seems conceivable that district councils of village representatives might be formed without endangering what is called our hold on India, or playing into the hands of those seditious Brahmin souls, whose sedition is in part due to our secrecy —though they know every one of our secrets—and in part to our very uncertain manners. In the measures for working out some system of popular credit, concerting irrigation projects, improving agriculture, settling disputed points about forest and grazing lands, and a score of other matters, such councils would be of enormous value. Moreover, their effect would be to bring opinion on all sorts of matters and grievances direct to the ears of the authorities instead of its passing through the cloud of interested, and frequently corrupt, native subordinates, whose petty tyrannies form one of the heaviest loads of the people. With respect to the demand for adding a Native member or members of the Governors' Executive Councils and to the India Council at home, I will only say that in my belief such a step would profoundly reassure and conciliate Indian opinion. Indian opinion and a consistent regard to Indian requirements must be the fly-wheel of a policy of true internal development, the grand corrective of drift. So far as troops and police are necessary at all for the suppression of possible rebellion and disturbance, they are necessary because of the mistakes into which we fall through being out of touch with the thoughts and feelings of the people. With a satisfied and contented people the need for troops would be measured pretty much by the extent of our ability to make terms with Russia.

The issues which I have touched upon have been raised to prominence by the famine, but they are ever present in our Indian Empire. The salvation of the rayat, if indeed he can be saved, may seem to some a not very heroic affair, and that is the issue to which we come at the end. Some of us may value India for its glitter and prestige, just as the *nouveau riche* enjoys the sense of his country place, with its liveried servants in the hall and its peacocks on the lawn. But it is, after all, the rayats and not we who keep India going, and the rayats, weakened by famine and "bleeding," and by the uprooting of old institutions, are perishing while India is drifting.

PUBLIC MEETINGS ON INDIAN QUESTIONS.

THE WORK OF THE BRITISH COMMITTEE.

On October 18 Miss Alison Garland addressed a large meeting at the Co-operative Hall, Ashton-under-Lyne, on "The Famine in India, by one who had seen it." Mrs. Moss presided. The lecture was illustrated by limelight views. Those showing the terribly emaciated condition of the people caused a sensation among the audience.

Miss Garland gave a similar lecture at Nelson, Lancashire, on October 23. There was also a large attendance. About seventy lantern slides were shown.

On October 25 Miss Garland addressed a meeting at Cramlington, Northumberland. Councillor Willis presided over a full house. Miss Garland gave an interesting account of the Indian National Congress and its aims.

On Friday, October 26, speaking on Current Politics at Camboise, Miss Garland gave an account of the condition of women in India, urging that more Government money should be expended in the education of both boys and girls. She also described her visit to the famine-stricken parts of India.

Sir W. Wedderburn will address a meeting on Sunday next, November 4, at Tunbridge Wells, on the Indian Famine.

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji will address a meeting of the Women's Liberal Association, Shepton Mallet, on November 7.

Mr. S. H. Swinny will address a meeting of the Petersfield Literary and Debating Society, Petersfield, on November 9. The subject of his address is "The Recent Indian Famine."

Meetings on behalf of the British Committee have also been arranged as follows :—

Nov. 2, Hayward's Heath.
,, 3, Tunbridge Wells.
,, 7, St. Alban's.
,, 13, Burnley.
,, 15, Stalybridge.
,, 27, Manchester.
,, 28, Egremont.
Dec. 6, St. Nathaniel's Y.M.S., Liverpool.
1901.
Jan. 15, Hipperholme and Lightcliffe W.L.A.

Open Letters to Lord Curzon ON FAMINES IN INDIA.

By ROMESH C. DUTT, C.I.E.

London: KEGAN PAUL & Co., price 7/6. Obtainable in India through any bookseller.

"Mr. R. C. Dutt's volume is extremely opportune at the present time, and his position, that an excessive land tax renders the agricultural population unable to face two or three successive years of drought, calls at least for careful examination. . . . . Mr. Dutt is on less debatable ground in pleading for a reduction of the annual drain to England and for the more extended employment of the Indians in civil employ."—*The Times.*

"Mr. Dutt succeeds in showing that, on the whole, areas of recurrent famine have been identical with those of excessive assessment."—*The Daily News.*

"Nothing could be better than the book on Indian Famines which Mr. Dutt has just published in the form of some Open Letters to Lord Curzon. It is thoroughly informed well-reasoned, and temperate; it tells the enquiring man exactly what he ought to know." —*The Daily Chronicle.*

"We would draw special attention to Mr. Dutt's own convincing and eloquent plea. hidden away in the final pages of the appendix, for the creation of such representative institutions as should enable the Government of India to utilise native services and keep abreast of native opinion."—*The Manchester Guardian.*

"His recommendations are that the land tax should be moderated, that irrigation works should be constructed, and that the public debt and the public expenditure of India should be reduced. These proposals he supports with a wealth of detail of all kinds, which proves his mastery of the subject and makes good his claim to the attention of the governing authorities." *The World.*

"His view that it is inequitable to make India pay for the maintenance of a large army to be used for the general purposes of the Empire has the support of many high authorities who are by no means to be described as Little Englanders."—*Literature.*

LONDON INDIAN SOCIETY.

DADABHAI NAOROJI, Esq., President.

Above Society on receipt of 5 anna stamps will give information regarding course of study and cost of living in England.

Apply, Mr. J. M. PAREKH, 1, Cloisters, Temple, E.C.; or

Dr. MULLICK,
85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

THE FORWARD POLICY AND ITS RESULTS;

OR,

Thirty-Five Years' Work Amongst the Tribes on our North-Western Frontier of India.

By RICHARD ISAAC BRUCE, C.I.E.,

Formerly Political Agent, Beluchistan: late Commissioner and Superintendent, Derajat Division, Punjab, India.

Just Published. With 28 Illustrations and a Map. 8vo, 15s. net.

London: LONGMANS, GREEN & CO.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

Dr. W. Venor says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., New Medical Hall, Meerut.

TRADE MARK JVARA-HARI

is what its name implies **FEVER DESTROYER,**

and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER I know.
C. E. Wood, Capt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. Narsinga Row.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I have much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage.
C. S. Srinivasa, Chairman.

Omum-Carpoor TRADE MARK

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans., Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY, 43, King William St., London, E.C., and 27, Second Line Beach, Madras

"INDIA," 1901.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

In future "INDIA" will be forwarded only to persons in respect of whom subscriptions have been actually received at the London office. To this rule there will be no exception.

In order to obtain every number published during 1901 it is necessary that the name of the Subscriber and his Subscription should be received in London before December 31, 1900, as back numbers will not be stocked. New names will be added as received, but no back numbers can be obtained.

Subscribers are requested to cut out the Order Form printed below, and forward it to the London office, together with a Post Office Money Order for the sterling equivalent of Six Rupees (net), made payable to W. Douglas Hall, Manager of "INDIA."

ORDER FORM.

To the Manager of "INDIA,"
84 & 85, *Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.*

Please send "INDIA" during 1901,

To be written clearly.
Name ____________________
Address ____________________
____

for which is enclosed the sum of Six Rupees.

Printed by A. Bonner, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.